

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 have been examined. Claims 3, 4, 10, and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 13, and 15-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Also, the Examiner has indicated that claims 5, 7, 12 and 14 contain allowable subject matter.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 3, 4, 10 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Since claims 3 and 10 have been canceled with prejudice or disclaimer, the rejection of these claims is moot. Also, with respect to claims 4 and 11, Applicants submit that the amendments to the claims overcome the rejection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) - Nishigaki et al. in view of Bergeron et al.

Claims 1-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nishigaki et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,209,688; hereinafter “Nishigaki”) in view of Bergeron et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,897,414; “Bergeron”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As a preliminary matter, Applicants note that although claims 1-18 have been indicated to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner only has provided reasons why claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 13 and 15-18 are rejected. Accordingly, Applicants assume that the Examiner did not intend to reject claims 3-5, 7, 10-12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 1 states that, when the transparent electrodes and the partition walls are properly positioned, a combination of the first positioning mark and the second positioning mark forms a predetermined figure. On the other hand, Nishigaki and Bergeron (alone or in combination) do not teach or suggest these features. Nishigaki discloses a plasma display panel with a pair of insulating substrates wherein electrodes are formed on the inner sides of each of the insulating substrates. However, Nishigaki does not teach or suggest that, “when the transparent electrodes and the partition walls are properly positioned, a combination of the first positioning mark and the second positioning mark forms a predetermined figure,” as Applicants claim. There is no mention at all of positioning marks in Nishigaki. Additionally, Examiner readily admits in the Office Action that Nishigaki “fail[s] to disclose a first positioning mark disposed in at least two or more positions outside the display area of the first substrate; and a second positioning mark disposed in at least two or more position[s] outside the display area of the second substrate; wherein the first positioning marks and the second positioning marks are disposed so that the positional relation between the transparent electrodes and the partition walls can directly be recognized.”

Bergeron does not remedy the deficiencies of Nishigaki. Bergeron discloses a manufacturing process for a matrix-addressable device such as a flat-panel CRT display. Bergeron’s FIG. 1 depicts corner and edge fiducials 54_C and 54_E utilized to provide alignment during the fabrication of a baseplate structure 20 and during assembly of a faceplate structure 22 to the baseplate structure 20 (column 6, lines 36-47). However, Bergeron does not mention “a second positioning mark disposed in at least two or more positions outside the display area of the second substrate,” as recited in Applicants’ claim. Furthermore, Examiner has admitted that

Bergeron “does not specifically teach fiducial marks on the second substrate. In addition, there is also no teaching or suggestion in Bergeron of a combination of the first positioning mark and the second positioning mark forming a predetermined figures when the transparent electrodes and the partition walls are properly positioned, as Applicants claim. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the references.

Claim 8 states that, when the first partition walls and the second partition walls are properly positioned, a combination of the first positioning mark and the second positioning mark forms a predetermined figure. Applicants submit that Nishigaki and Bergeron do not teach these features for reasons that are similar to the reasons presented above in conjunction with claim 1.

Since claims 15 and 17 contain features that are analogous to the features recited in claim 1 or 8, Applicants submit that they are patentable for similar reasons. Also, since claims 2, 6, 9, 13, 16, and 18 depend upon claim 1, 8, 15, or 17, Applicants submit that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Newly Added Claims

Applicants have added new claims 19-38 to provide more varied protection for the present invention.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/603,934

Attorney Docket No.: Q76224

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER


Lenny R. Jiang
Registration No. 52,432

Date: February 28, 2005